

Remarks

Claims 2 and 3 are herein amended, and claim 1 is canceled. Claim 2 is amended to depend from pending claim 3. Support for this amendment is found in claims 1, 2 and 3 as originally filed. Claim 3 is herein amended to independent form, and also to incorporate the subject matter of claim 1. Support for this amendment is found in claims 1 and 3 as originally filed. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of claims as originally filed, in this or in another application sharing the same priority date.

Claims 2-8 remain pending in the application. No new matter has been added, and no new material presented that would necessitate an additional search on the part of the Examiner.

Applicants note with appreciation that the Office Action withdraws rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of Buchroeder (U.S. patent number 4,278,330).

Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action on page 5 states that claims 3-6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and objects only to claims 3-6 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claim 3 as herein amended is rewritten as an independent claim, and includes all of the subject matter of claim 1. Claims 4-6 depend directly or indirectly on claim 3 as here amended. As claims 3-6 are no longer dependent on a rejected base claim, accordingly these claims are in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Specification

In response to the objection to the specification for failing to include headings. Applicants assert that both of rules 37 C.F.R. 1.77(a) and 37 C.F.R. 1.77(b) state merely an

order of appearance, and do not require section headings. For these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

In response to the objection to the abstract of the disclosure, Applicants assert that the abstract as originally filed was present on a separate page, and further, that this abstract in fact contains less than 150 words. This objection can properly be withdrawn. In the alternative, Applicants respectfully request further information regarding this objection.

Claims are novel

The Office Action on page 3, ¶3 rejects claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of Kato et al. (U.S. patent number 4,702,567, issued October 27, 1987).

Claim 1 is herein canceled, therefore rejection of this claim is moot.

Prior to analyzing the art cited in the Office Action, Applicants believe that a brief description of the subject matter of claim 2 would be of use to the Examiner.

Claim 2 as here amended depends from claim 3 and thereby incorporates the subject matter of claim 3. Claim 2 is directed to a zoom lens with a front lens group and a controllable lens group. The controllable lens group has two lens elements which are made of different lens materials and are movable with respect to each other for focusing the zoom lens without displacing the front lens group. The zoom lens has a folding mirror arranged between the front lens group and the controllable lens group. The zoom lens also has a lens stop arranged near the first lens element of the controllable lens group that is movable together with this lens group.

Applicants below characterize the subject matter in Kato et al. and show that this reference is not the same as claim 2 as here amended.

Kato et al., U.S. patent number 4,702,567, issued October 27, 1987

Kato shows a zoom lens with a lens group that moves axially to change the focal length of the zoom lens system. See Kato, column 3, lines 24-27. Kato also shows a zoom lens with an axially movable lens group to maintain a constant position of an image plane. Ibid. column 3, lines 27-30. The zoom lens has a compound lens group containing a plurality of subgroups of lens members arranged to move as a unit upon zooming. Ibid. column 3, lines 30-36.

The present claims are not the same as the cited art

The legal standard for rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 is identity.

Claim 2 as here amended is directed to a zoom lens with a front lens group and a controllable lens group. The controllable lens group has two lens elements which are made of different lens materials and are movable with respect to each other for focusing the zoom lens without displacing the front lens group. The zoom lens has a folding mirror arranged between the front lens group and the controllable lens group. The zoom lens also has a lens stop arranged near the first lens element of the controllable lens group that is movable together with this lens group.

Kato fails to show a zoom lens with a front lens group and a controllable lens group, such that the zoom lens has a folding mirror arranged between the front lens group and the controllable lens group.

Further, the Office Action admits on page 5 that the prior art fails to teach a folding mirror arranged between the front lens group and the controllable lens group, as is the subject matter of claim 2 as here amended.

As Kato is not the same as the subject matter of claim 2 as here amended, this claim is not anticipated by Kato. Applicants assert that claim 2 as here amended is novel, and respectfully request that rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims are not obvious

The Office Action on page 4, ¶4 rejects claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Kato et al. (U.S. patent number 4,702,567, issued October 27, 1987) and further in view of Jo et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,844,989, issued January 18, 2005). Kato is characterized above.

Claim 7 is directed to a camera comprising a zoom lens with a front lens group and a controllable lens group. The controllable lens group has two lens elements which are made of different lens materials and are movable with respect to each other for focusing the zoom lens without displacing the front lens group.

Claim 8 is directed to a hand-held apparatus with input means, information processing means, display means, and a camera. The camera has a zoom lens with a front lens group and a controllable lens group, and the controllable lens group has two lens elements which are made of different lens materials and are movable with respect to each other for focusing the zoom lens without displacing the front lens group.

Kato fails to teach or suggest a camera, as admitted by the Office Action on page 4. Further, Kato fails to teach or suggest a hand-held apparatus comprising input means, information processing means and display means, as admitted by the Office Action on page 5.

Jo et al., U.S. patent number 6,844,989, issued January 18, 2005

Jo shows a lens system comprised of a first lens, a perforated iris separated from the first lens by a designated distance, i.e. a constant distance, a second lens separated from the perforated iris by a designated distance, and a third lens separated from the second lens by a designated distance. See Jo et al., column 3, lines 7-15.

Jo fails to teach or suggest any zoom lens, as is the subject matter of Applicants' claims 7 and 8. Further, Jo fails to teach or suggest a camera with a zoom lens. Jo also fails to teach or suggest a handheld apparatus that includes a camera with a zoom lens.

Further, Jo fails to teach or suggest any lens elements that are movable with respect to each other, as is the subject matter of Applicants' claims 7 and 8.

Jo also fails to teach or suggest lens elements made of different lens materials, as is the subject matter of Applicants' claims 7 and 8. All of the lenses in Jo are made of one material, plastic. Ibid, claim 3, 5 and 7.

As Jo fails to cure any of the defects of Kato with respect to claims 7 and 8, therefore claims 7 and 8 are not obvious in view of Kato and Jo, alone or in combination.

For any of these reasons, Applicants assert that the present claims are not obvious, and respectfully request that rejection of claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Summary

On the basis of the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

If there are any questions regarding these remarks, the Examiners are invited and encouraged to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number provided.

Respectfully submitted,



Sonia K. Guterman

Reg. No. 44,729

Attorney for Applicants

Lawson & Weitzen, LLP

88 Black Falcon Ave., Suite 345

Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2481

Tel: (617) 439-4990

Fax: (617) 439-3987

Dated: August 18, 2006